arXiv:1403.3816v2 [math.OA] 11 Apr 2014

Entropy and entanglement bounds for reduced density matrices of fermionic states

Eric A. Carlen[1] and Elliott H. Lieb[2]

1. Department of Mathematics, Hill Center,
Rutgers University, 110 Frelinghuysen Road Piscataway NJ 08854-8019 USA

2. Departments of Mathematics and Physics, Jadwin Hall,
Princeton University, Washington Road, Princeton, NJ 08544-0001

April 1, 2014

Abstract

Unlike bosons, fermions always have a non-trivial entanglement. Intuitively, Slater determinantal states should be the least entangled states. To make this intuition precise we investigate entropy and entanglement of fermionic states and prove some extremal and near extremal properties of reduced density matrices of Slater determinantal states. We show, in particular, that the excess of entanglement of formation over the Slater value is a faithful measure of fermionic entanglement.

Mathematics subject classification numbers: 81V99, 82B10, 94A17
Key Words: Density matrix, Entropy, Partial trace, Entanglement

1 Introduction

While bosons are often thought of as more complicated than fermions because of the phenomenon of Bose-Einstein condensation, there is at least one way in which fermions are more complicated, and that is the topic studied here. We investigate the entanglement of fermions caused by the Pauli principle and we seek the minimum possible entropy and entanglement. This entanglement is not zero and has been the subject of much discussion in the literature [1], but comparatively little is known about the precise quantification of entanglement forced by statistics, except in low dimension. Intuitively, minimal entanglement should occur for (Slater) determinantal states. To make sense of this intuition quantitative measurements of entanglement are needed,

© 2014 by the authors. This paper may be reproduced, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes.

Our motivation for studying minimal fermionic entanglement and minimal entropy stems from an effort to understand the two-particle density matrix of fermions, which is an important topic for density functional theory and many-body theory. Information about two-particle correlations are potentially useful, and entanglement is one of them.

It is important to be clear about the definition of entanglement. Several authors define entanglement for fermions as the entanglement relative to a Slater determinantal state. See [1, 9, 12] for reviews and discussion. This difference is sometimes called 'correlation'. In any case, whatever definition one uses, a basic question is to quantify the entanglement of a given multi-particle state and to determine which states minimize various measures of entanglement. The next section will contain precise definitions. While there is a considerable literature on the definition and information theoretic value of various measures of entanglement, it is not our goal here to dwell on this matter. Rather, our goal is to find precise, sharp values for several measures of entanglement and entropy for fermionic states, about which relatively little is known.

The measures of entanglement we study here all involve von Neumann entropy. In many-body physics it is customary for the $k-$body reduced matrix to have trace $\binom{N}{k}$. Standard measures of entanglement involve entropy, however, and to define entropy we require all density matrices ρ to have *unit trace* ($\mathrm{Tr}\rho = 1$) – as we do here. This should be kept in mind in the following.

Bosons, in contrast to fermions, are not necessarily entangled. The simplest state of N bosons is a condensate, namely the pure state $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ where Ψ is a simple product, $\Psi(x_1, \ldots, x_N) = \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_N)$ and ϕ is normalized. All reduced density matrices are of the same form, i.e., pure products, and all have zero entropy and entanglement. Of course a bosonic state can have arbitrarily high entropy and entangled reduced density matrices but we are interested in the lowest values. The product states are also important because they form a (necessarily non-orthogonal) basis for bosonic wave functions.

The simplest fermionic wave functions one can think of are determinants. These span the space and an orthonormal basis can be chosen from among them. Our goal is to show that they have the smallest entropy and entanglement – and these minimum values are not zero. From this point of view, *determinants are the fermionic analog of bosonic condensates*, a fact that does not seem to have been remarked on before.

More specifically we prove theorems about the mutual information and the entanglement entropy of two fermions in a system of N fermions. The one-body density matrix is well understood since it is characterized by having eigenvalues less than or equal to $1/N$ (in our normalization) and thus the entropy of a single fermion, S_1,in a sea of N others satisfies $S_1 \geq \ln N$. This bound is achieved if and only if the N-particle state is a Slater determinant. The two-body matrix, in contrast, can have large eigenvalues in a BCS type state [14] and, therefore, one might suppose that it might have anomalously low entropy and entanglement compared to what it would have in a determinantal state. We prove that this is not so! More precisely, the largest possible eigenvalue of two-body density matrix [14] is $2/(N-1)$ (in our normalization) but nothing is said about simultaneously having other large eigenvalues, leading to an entropy of order $\ln(N/2)$. Indeed, we show that the two-body entropy is at least of order $2 \ln N$, characteristic of a Slater determinantal state.

Let us make a remark before proceeding. The number N will appear in some theorems and it might be argued that each electron is necessarily entangled with all the electrons in the universe through the Pauli principle, and thus $N \approx \infty$. This is not physically correct, of course. The mathematical solution to this apparent paradox is to realize that a density matrix represents a state on an algebra of observables, and that one must use the lowest dimension possible to accommodate all the observables under consideration in the algebra. One can call this a kind of 'coarse graining'. In our case we imagine that N particles are trapped in a box (or in an isolated atom) and our observables refer only to properties inside the box. The Hilbert space for the Ndensity-body matrix is then the antisymmetric product $\wedge^N\mathcal{H}$, where $\mathcal{H}$ is, e.g., the Hilbert space of one particle (including spin) in the box.

We now define our terms and state our theorems.

2 Entanglement for Bipartite Fermionic States

Let ρ_{12} be a density matrix on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. Thus, $\rho_{12} > 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\rho_{12} = 1$. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 denote its partial traces which are density matrices on $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ respectively. Let $S_{12} = -\mathrm{Tr}\rho_{12}\log\rho_{12}$ denote the entropy of ρ_{12}, and let S_1 and S_2 denote the entropies of ρ_1 and ρ_2 respectively, which are equal in the fermionic or bosonic case. For fermions $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ are identical, of course.

The bipartite state ρ_{12} is *finitely separable* in case it can be decomposed as a convex combination of tensor products:

$$\rho_{12} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \nu_k \, \rho_1^k \otimes \rho_2^k \tag{2.1}$$

where the ν_k are positive and sum to 1, and each ρ_α^k is a density matrix on $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$. A bipartite state is *separable* if it is in the closure of the set of finitely separable states. A bipartite state that is not separable is *entangled*.

The *entanglement of formation* $\mathrm{E_f}$, introduced by Bennett *et al.* [3, 4], is defined in terms of the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr}(\rho\log\rho)$ by the formula

$$\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) = \inf\left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j S(\mathrm{Tr}_2\omega^j) \;:\; \rho_{12} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k \omega^k \right\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where Tr and Tr_2, respectively, are the traces over the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ and the partial trace over $\mathcal{H}_2$ alone. The coefficients λ_k in the expansion are required to be positive and sum to 1, and each ω^k is a state on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$, which, by the concavity of S, may be taken to be a pure state without affecting the value of the infimum. Since the two partial traces of a pure state have the same spectrum and hence the same entropies [2], $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12})$ is symmetric in 1 and 2. It is known that $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) = 0$ if and only if ρ_{12} is separable; see [5] for a discussion of this result in relation to other measures of entanglement.

Any bipartite fermionic state will be entangled according to this definition. Another definition that is appropriate for fermions is to say that ρ_{12} is *fermionic-separable* if and only if it is a convex combination of projections onto 2-body Slater determinantal states [1]. Otherwise it is *fermionic entangled*. Thus, one looks for a measure of entanglement that is positive (sometimes called 'faithful') on all entangled states and zero on fermionic-separable states.

An interesting class of bipartite fermionic states arises from the reduced two-particle density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state. As usual, if $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ is the density matrix for the N fermions, the k-particle density matrix is defined by a partial trace to be

$$\rho_{1\cdots k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1\cdots N}\ \rho_{1\cdots N}. \tag{2.3}$$

Obviously, it does not matter which of the N particles we single out for special treatment.

One relatively simple theorem sets the stage for the more difficult theorems in this paper. We shall prove that convex combinations of Slater determinants uniquely minimize the usual 'entanglement of formation', $\mathrm{E_f}$, and, therefore, the excess of $\mathrm{E_f}$ over the Slater value is a faithful measure of fermionic entanglement.

This is perhaps the first faithful quantification of fermionic entanglement that uses conventional quantities, like $\mathrm{E_f}$, which have an operational meaning. It is unlike the 'Slater rank', which is faithful by definition [1, 9] but which is difficult to compute, is discontinuous, and does not have a clear operational interpretation. A quantitative study of entanglement of formation for fermions has been made in [9] based on a generalization of Wooter's notion of *concurrence*, but this is only possible in low dimensions, and not the arbitrary dimensions considered here.

2.1 THEOREM. *Let ρ_{12} be a bipartite fermionic state. Then*

$$\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) \geq \ln(2) \tag{2.4}$$

and there is equality if and only if ρ_{12} is a convex combination of pure-state Slater determinants; i.e., the state is fermionic separable. That is

$$\mathrm{E_f^A}(\rho_{12}) = \mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) - \ln(2)$$

is a faithful measure of fermionic entanglement. In particular, if ρ_{12} is the two-particle density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state, then (2.4) is true and equality holds if and only if the state is fermionic separable.

2.2 Remark. Were we computing the entropy using $\log_2$ in place of the natural logarithm, the lower bound would be 1.

Another faithful measure of entanglement is the *squashed entanglement*, introduced by Tucci [13] and studied by Christandl and Winter [7]. It is defined by

$$\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) = \tfrac{1}{2} \inf_{\rho_{123}} \{-S_{123} - S_3 + S_{13} + S_{23}\} \tag{2.5}$$

where 3 refers to an additional Hilbert space and $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_3$, and $\mathrm{Tr}_3 \rho_{123} = \rho_{12}$. The infimum is taken over all such extensions of ρ_{12}. As a consequence of strong subadditivity [10], $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) \geq 0$.

The squashed entanglement is a faithful measure of entanglement, meaning that $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) = 0$ if and only if ρ_{12} is separable (in the usual non-fermionic sense)[5]. It is less than or equal to the entanglement of formation, and it is claimed to measure only quantum mechanical correlations. We conjecture that convex combinations of Slater determinants uniquely minimize the squashed entanglement, as they do for $\mathrm{E_f}$.

Questions: If ρ_{12} is the 2-particle reduced density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state, is $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12})$ greater than or equal to the squashed entanglement of an N-particle Slater determinant. If so, is the difference a faithful measure of fermionic entanglement?

Theorem 2.1 shows this to be the case for entanglement of formation, and the first step in the proof was to compute the $\mathrm{E_f}$ of a two-particle density matrix of a Slater. This number turned out to be independent of N. The situation is different for $\mathrm{E_{sq}}$, for we cannot compute $\mathrm{E_{sq}}$ for a Slater determinant, but we can prove the following theorem, which definitely shows that there must be an N dependence. It also shows that $\mathrm{E_{sq}}$ is very much less than $\mathrm{E_f}$ for a Slater determinant. This result was discovered by Christandl, Schuch and Winter [8].

2.3 THEOREM (Squashed entanglement for Slaters)**.** *Let ρ_{12} be the 2-particle reduced density matrix of an N-particle Slater determinant. Then*

$$\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{N+2}{N-2} & \text{if } N \text{ is even} \\ \\ \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{N+3}{N-1} & \text{if } N \text{ is odd} \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

This shows that the squashed entanglement can be *much smaller* than the entanglement of formation. We *conjecture* that (2.6) is an equality and, moreover, that it gives the lowest possible $\mathrm{E_{sq}}$ among all 2-particle fermionic reduced density matrices.

An example that is, perhaps, even more interesting is the Yang pairing state. Here, the fermionic entanglement of formation $(\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) - \ln(2))$ is not zero, as it is for a determinant; indeed, it is unbounded.

The definition of the pairing state is the following. The one-particle Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^M$ and the number of particles is $N \leq M$. Both N and M are even integers, so we define $m = M/2$ and $n = N/2$. We choose an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$, u_i with $1 \leq i \leq M$ and we consider the set of $2n$-particle Slater determinants that are composed of n pairs of vectors $\pi_i = u_{2i}, u_{2(i+1)}$. There are m such pairs and there are $\binom{m}{n}$ such determinants, denoted by ϕ_α. The pairing state (a vector in $\mathcal{H}^{\wedge N}$) is given by

$$|\Psi\rangle = \tbinom{m}{n}^{-1/2} \sum_\alpha \phi_\alpha. \tag{2.7}$$

Yang [14] proved that the largest eigenvalue of ρ_{12} for this state (i.e., the operator norm) is strictly larger than than that of any N-particle fermionic state built on the $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^M$ not of this form.

2.4 THEOREM (Entropy and entanglement of the pairing state)**.** *Let ρ_{12} be the two-particle reduced denstiy matrix of the N-particle pairing state built on the $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^M$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho_{12}) &= \ln[(2n-1)m(m-1)] \\ &- \frac{m^2-mn+n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)} \ln[m^2-mn+n-1] \\ &- (2m^2-m-1)\frac{n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)} \ln[n-1] \ . \end{aligned}$$

The fermionic entanglement of formation is

$$\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) - \ln(2) = \frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}[\ln(m) - \ln(2)] \ . \tag{2.8}$$

and the squashed entanglement is bounded by

$$\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) \geq \frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)} \ln(m) + \left(1 - \frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}\right) \tfrac{1}{2} \ln\left(\tfrac{m+1}{m-1}\right) \ . \tag{2.9}$$

Note that for $M \gg N \gg 1$, the leading term is $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) \asymp \frac{\ln M}{N}$, and the lower bound on $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12})$ is of the same order. and is, presumably, close to optimal.

3 Extremal entropic properties of Slater determinants

In this section we are concerned with the case in which ρ_{12} is the reduced 2-particle density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state. As usual, if $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ is the density matrix for the N fermions, the k-particle density matrix is defined by a partial trace to be

$$\rho_{1\cdots k} = \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1\cdots N} \ \rho_{1\cdots N}. \tag{3.1}$$

Obviously, it does not matter which of the N particles we single out for special treatment.

The entropy of a one-particle reduced density matrix of an as N-particle fermionic state is at least $\ln(N)$, and this bound is achieved if and only if the state is a Slater determinant. This follows from the well known fact that the eigenvalues of the reduced one body density matrix are bounded above by $1/N$ in our normalization. In fact Coleman's Theorem (see e.g., [11, Theorem 3.1] says that the extreme points of the set of all reduced one body density matrices of N-particle (mixed) fermionic state are the reduced density matrices of N-particle Slater determinants, for which all eigenvalues are exactly $1/N$.

Less is known about the set of all reduced 2-body density matrices. Yang's Theorem [14] says no eigenvalue of such a density matrix can exceed $N\binom{N}{2}^{-1} = 2/(N-1)$, compared to $\binom{N}{2}^{-1}$, which is the value of every non-zero eigenvalue for a pure Slater determinant.

Yang's bound would allow a reduced density matrix with $(N-1)/2$ eigenvalues close to this size, and hence an entropy of order $\ln(N)$.

The entropy of a reduced 2-particle density matrix of an N-particle Slater state is $\ln(\binom{N}{2})$ which is of order $2\ln(N)$. In fact, the Yang state has a very large entropy, which we compute in the Appendix, due to a large number of very small eigenvalues, and is not competitive in the search for any entropy minimizer. *We conjecture that the pure state Slater determinants have the reduced 2-particle density matrices of minimum entropy.* The following says that the Slater determinants minimize the entropy to leading order.

3.1 THEOREM (Lowest 2-particle Entropy)**.** *Let ρ_{12} be the 2-particle reduced density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state. Then*

$$S(\rho_{12}) \geq 2\ln N + \mathcal{O}(1)\ .$$

The proof of Theorem 3.1 relies on the next theorem, which concerns *mutual information*; i.e., $S_1 + S_2 - S_{12}$, and is used in proving Theorem 2.1.

3.2 THEOREM (Mutual Information)**.** *Let ρ_{12} be the reduced 2-particle density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state. Then*

$$S_1 + S_2 - S_{12} = 2S_1 - S_{12} \geq \ln\left(\frac{2}{1-\mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2}\right) \geq \ln\left(\frac{2}{1-e^{-S_1}}\right), \tag{3.2}$$

and there is equality in the first inequality if and only if the N-particle fermionic state is a pure-state Slater determinant. There is equality in the second, if and only if the nonzero eigenvalues of ρ_1 are equal.

More generally, for an N- particle fermionic state $\rho_{1,\dots,N}$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} S_j - S_{1\dots N} = NS_1 - S_{1\dots N} \geq -\ln e_N(\rho_1), \tag{3.3}$$

where $e_N(\rho_1)$ is the N^{th} elementary symmetric function of the eigenvalues of ρ_1, namely, $\sum_{i_1,i_2,\dots,i_N} \lambda_{i_1}\cdots\lambda_{i_N}$. This can be expressed in terms of $p_j = \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^j$ as

$$e_N = \frac{1}{N!}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & \dots & \\ p_2 & 1 & 2 & 0 & \dots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ p_{N-1} & p_{N-2} & \dots & 1 & N-1 \\ p_N & p_{N-1} & \dots & p_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{3.4}$$

For example, $e_3 = (1 - 3p_2 + 2p_3)/6$.

3.3 Remark. Since ρ_1 is the reduced 1-particle density matrix of an N-particle fermionic state, the eigenvalues of ρ_1 are at most $1/N$, and hence $0 \leq \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2 \leq 1/N$, and the upper bound is saturated if and only if the N-particle fermionic state is a pure-state Slater determinant, for it is only in this case that there are N eigenvalues equal to $1/N$. Moreover, if $\mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2$ is very small, then S_1 is necessarily very large since, by Jensen's inequality,

$$\mathrm{e}^{-S_1} \leq \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2\ . \tag{3.5}$$

4 Proofs of Theorems

While each of the theorems above refers to fermionic states, we shall deduce them from the following lemma in which *no assumption on statistics* is made. It is a quantitative version of *subadditivity of the von Neumann entropy*, for *general* bipartite (and N-partite) states, which we have not seen before and might be useful in other cases. The method of proof of this theorem also yields quantitative remainder terms for other entropy inequalities – which will be discussed in a separate paper [6].

4.1 LEMMA (Quantitative subadditivity)**.**

$$S_{12} - S_1 - S_2 \leq 2 \ln \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr} \left[\sqrt{\rho_{12}} - \sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2} \right]^2 \right) . \tag{4.1}$$

In particular, $S_1 + S_2 - S_{12} \geq 0$ *with equality if and only if* $\rho_{12} = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$.

More generally, with an obvious notation, if $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ *is a density matrix on* $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$ *then*

$$S_{1\cdots N} - \sum_1^N S_j \leq 2 \ln \left(1 - \tfrac{1}{2} \mathrm{Tr} \left[\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}} - \sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_N} \right]^2 \right) . \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Recall the Peierls-Bogoliubov inequality: If H and A are self adjoint operators and $\mathrm{Tr} e^{-H} = 1$, then

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(e^{-H+A} \right) \geq e^{\mathrm{Tr} A e^{-H}} \ .$$

To prove (4.1), apply this with

$$H = -\log \rho_{12} \qquad \text{and} \qquad A = \tfrac{1}{2} (\log \rho_1 + \log \rho_2 - \log \rho_{12}) \ .$$

Then with $\Delta := \frac{1}{2}(S_{12} - S_1 - S_2)$, by the Peierls-Bogoliubov inequality and the Golden-Thompson inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\Delta} &= \exp \left[\mathrm{Tr} \rho_{12} \tfrac{1}{2} (\log \rho_1 + \log \rho_2 - \log \rho_{12}) \right] \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr} \exp \left[\tfrac{1}{2} (\log \rho_{12} + \log (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) \right] \\ &\leq \mathrm{Tr} \exp \left[\tfrac{1}{2} \log \rho_{12} \right] \exp \left[\tfrac{1}{2} \log (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) \right] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr} \left[\rho_{12}^{1/2} (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)^{1/2} \right] \ . \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left[\rho_{12}^{1/2} (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)^{1/2} \right] = \tfrac{1}{2} \left(1 - \mathrm{Tr} \left[\rho_{12}^{1/2} - (\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2)^{1/2} \right]^2 \right) \ , \tag{4.3}$$

this proves (4.1). An obvious adaptation proves (4.2). □

We next turn to Theorem 3.2, which is used in the proof of our bounds on both entropy and entanglement.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. By the hypothesis on ρ_{12}, all of its eigenfunctions with non-zero eigenvalues are anti-symmetric, and $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{12}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}\right) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{12}}\left[P_{\mathrm{fer}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}P_{\mathrm{fer}}\right]\right) \ ,$$

where P_{fer} is the orthogonal projection on the antisymmetric subspace of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, and then by the Schwarz inequality,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{12}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}\right) \leq \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[P_{\mathrm{fer}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}P_{\mathrm{fer}}\right]^2\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\mathrm{Tr}\left[P_{\mathrm{fer}}\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 P_{\mathrm{fer}}\right]\right)^{1/2} \ . \tag{4.4}$$

Let $\sum_j \lambda_j |u_j\rangle\langle u_j|$ denote the spectral decomposition of $\rho_1 = \rho_2$. Then

$$P_{\mathrm{fer}}\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 P_{\mathrm{fer}} = \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j} \lambda_i\lambda_j |u_i \wedge u_j\rangle\langle u_i \wedge u_j| \tag{4.5}$$

where $u_i \wedge u_j = u_i \otimes u_j - u_j \otimes u_i$ is a vector of length $\sqrt{2}$, hence the factor of $\frac{1}{2}$. Thus,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[P_{\mathrm{fer}}\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2 P_{\mathrm{fer}}\right] = \sum_{i<j} \lambda_1\lambda_j = \tfrac{1}{2}(1 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2) \ .$$

Combining this with (4.1), (4.3) and (4.4), we obtain

$$S_{12} \leq S_1 + S_2 - \ln\left(\frac{2}{1 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2}\right) \ . \tag{4.6}$$

There is equality in (4.6) when ρ_{12} is is the reduced 2-particle density matrix of an N-particle Slater determinant since, in this case,

$$S_{12} = \ln\tbinom{N}{2} \ , \quad S_1 = S_2 = \ln N, \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2 = 1/N \ .$$

Moreover, whenever there is equality in (4.4), there must be equality in (4.4), in which case for some constant C, $\sqrt{\rho_{12}} = CP_{\mathrm{fer}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}P_{\mathrm{fer}}$, or, what is the same by (4.5)

$$\rho_{12} = C^2 \sum_{i<j} \lambda_i\lambda_j |u_i \wedge u_j\rangle\langle u_i \wedge u_j| \ .$$

Taking the partial trace Tr_2 of both sides, we obtain $\rho_1 = C^2 \sum_j \lambda_j(1 - \lambda_j)|u_j\rangle\langle u_j|$, from which we conclude that $C^2(1 - \lambda_j) = 1$ for each j. This means that ρ_1 is a normalized projection, and that ρ_{12} is the 2-particle reduced density matrix of a pure Slater determinant.

The inequality (3.3) follows from (4.2) in the same way that (3.3) follows from (4.1). The equation (3.4) for e_N in terms of power sums (using $p_1 = \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1 = 1$) is well known. □

We now give a second proof of Theorem 3.2. The essence of the first proof was to bound the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the antisymmetric part $P_{\mathrm{fer}}\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}P_{\mathrm{fer}}$ of $\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}$. In the first proof this was done in terms of the eigenvalues. Here we will do it using kernels since this method, while more cumbersome for this case, can be adapted to deal with tensor products of the 2-particle reduced density matrix.

Second proof of Theorem 3.2. Our starting point is (4.1). Let $k(x,x')$ denote the kernel for $\sqrt{\rho_1}$, which is also the kernel for $\sqrt{\rho_2}$. Then the projection of $\sqrt{\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2}$ onto the antisymmetric subspace has the kernel

$$\tfrac{1}{2}(k(x,x')k(y,y') - k(x,y')k(y,x')) \ .$$

The Hilbert-Schmidt norm of this is

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\left(2\sum_{x,x'y,y'} |k|^2(x,x')|k|^2(y,y') - 2\sum_{x,x'y,y'} k(x,x')k(x',y)k(y,y')k(y',x)\right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2}[(\mathrm{Tr}\rho_1)^2 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2\,]}.$$

Then from (4.1)

$$S_{12} - S_2 - S_2 \leq 2\ln\left(\sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2}[1 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2\,]}\right) \ ,$$

which is (3.2). It follows that for any two fermions, the entanglement of formation is at least $\ln 2$, and this bound is achieved for Slater determinants. □

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Suppose $N = 2n$, and that $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ is a fermionic N-particle state. Let γ_2 denote the reduced 2-particle density matrix. Then we can write

$$\mathcal{H}^{\otimes N} = \mathcal{K}^{\otimes n} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{K} := \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H} \ .$$

Then applying (4.2) where $S_j = S(\gamma_2)$ is the entropy of the reduced 2-particle density matrix,

$$S_{1\cdots N} \leq nS(\gamma_2) - N\ln N + \mathcal{O}(N) \ . \tag{4.7}$$

For $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ a pure state, we obtain

$$S(\gamma_2) \geq 2\ln N + \mathcal{O}(1)$$

by combining Cauchy-Schwarz, (4.2) and an estimate on

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left[P_{\mathrm{fer}}(\gamma_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \gamma_2)P_{\mathrm{fer}}\right]^2 \ . \tag{4.8}$$

However, in this case it is not so easy to estimate the quantity in (4.8)

Note that if $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ is a Slater determinant state, then

$$S(\gamma_2) = \ln\tbinom{N}{2} = 2\ln N + \mathcal{O}(1) \ .$$

We will apply (4.2) to an N-particle fermionic state with N even. Then each ρ_j is a copy of the reduced 2-particle density matrix γ_2. Then (4.7) becomes

$$S_{1\cdots N} - \tfrac{N}{2}S(\gamma_2) \leq 2\ln\left(\mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}}\,(\sqrt{\gamma_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sqrt{\gamma_2})\right) \ .$$

The main idea of the proof is the same as for (3.2): Since all the eigenvectors of $\rho_{1\cdots N}$ are antisymmetric, we can project all of the eigenvectors of $\sqrt{\gamma_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \sqrt{\gamma_2}$ onto $\wedge^N\mathcal{H}$,

and then apply Cauchy-Schwarz. This time, the antisymmetrization is more complicated, and we deal with it by expanding the kernels for the square roots.

Let

$$\sqrt{\gamma_2} = \sum_\alpha \sqrt{\lambda_\alpha}\ |\varphi^\alpha\rangle\langle\varphi^\alpha|$$

be the eigenfunction expansion of $\sqrt{\gamma_2}$, where each φ^α is a unit vector, each λ_α is non-negative, and $\sum_\alpha \lambda_\alpha = 1$. Then by a result of Yang [14], for each α there is an orthonormal basis $\{u_n^\alpha\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of $\mathcal{H}$ and non-negative numbers $\{a_j^\alpha\}_{j\in\mathbb{N}}$ so that

$$|\varphi^\alpha\rangle = \sum_{j\geq 1} a_j^\alpha u_{2j-1}^\alpha \wedge u_{2j}^\alpha \quad ,$$

where $\sum_{j\geq 1}(a_j^\alpha)^2 = \frac{1}{2}$ and where

$$u_{2j-1}^\alpha \wedge u_{2j}^\alpha = \left[u_{2j}^\alpha \otimes u_{2j-1}^\alpha - u_{2j-1}^\alpha \otimes u_{2j}^\alpha\right] \ . \tag{4.9}$$

We may then expand

$$\sqrt{\gamma_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes\sqrt{\gamma_2} = \sum_{\alpha_1\cdots\alpha_n}\left(\prod_{j=1}^n \lambda_{\alpha_j}^{1/2}\right)\left(|\varphi^{\alpha_1}\rangle\langle\varphi^{\alpha_1}|\otimes\cdots\otimes|\varphi^{\alpha_n}\rangle\langle\varphi^{\alpha_n}|\right)$$

To estimate $\mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}}\left[\sqrt{\gamma_2}\otimes\cdots\otimes\sqrt{\gamma_2}\right]$ it suffices to estimate each

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}}\ |\varphi^{\alpha_1}\rangle\langle\varphi^{\alpha_1}|\otimes\cdots\otimes|\varphi^{\alpha_n}\rangle\langle\varphi^{\alpha_n}|\right) \ , \tag{4.10}$$

The tensor product of the operators in 4.10 is the same as the projection onto the tensor product of the vectors $(|\varphi^{\alpha_1}\rangle\otimes\cdots\otimes|\varphi^{\alpha_n}\rangle)$. To get a meaningful estimate, we must antisymmetrize this vector. To do so we further expand

$$(|\varphi^{\alpha_1}\rangle\otimes\cdots\otimes|\varphi^{\alpha_n}\rangle) = \sum_{j^1\cdots j^n}\left(\prod_{k=1}^n a_{j^k}^{\alpha_k}\right) u_{2j^1-1}^{\alpha_1}\wedge u_{2j^1}^{\alpha_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes u_{2j^n-1}^{\alpha_n}\wedge u_{2j^n}^{\alpha_n}$$

Then, to estimate (4.10), it suffices to estimate each

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}}\ |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|\right) \tag{4.11}$$

where

$$\Psi = u_{2j^1-1}^{\alpha_1}\wedge u_{2j^1}^{\alpha_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes u_{2j^n-1}^{\alpha_n}\wedge u_{2j^n}^{\alpha_n} \ . \tag{4.12}$$

To do so, it suffices to antisymmetrize $u_{2j^1-1}^{\alpha_1}\otimes u_{2j^1}^{\alpha_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes u_{2j^n-1}^{\alpha_n}\otimes u_{2j^n}^{\alpha_n}$, and compensate for the missing terms (the second term in (4.9 for each factor) by multiplying by $2^{N/2}$.

The antisymmetrization yields a factor $\frac{1}{N!}$ and a Slater determinant of the $N\times N$ matrix $v_i(x_j)$ where each v_i is one of the vectors in 4.12.

Hadamard's inequality states that the absolute value of a determinant is no greater than the product of the norms of its rows. Since each of the vectors $u_j^{\alpha_k}$ is a unit vector, the absolute square of the Slater determinant is no greater than

$$\prod_{j=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} |v_i(x_j)|^2 \ .$$

At this point, following the proof in the previous case, we apply Schwarz's inequality to the integration in $x_1, \ldots, x_N$. For each j we note that the sum over x_j equals N because each vector v_i was assumed to be normalized. Thus, the integration yields a factor N^N. We conclude that with

$$\Phi := u_{2j^1-1}^{\alpha_1} \otimes u_{2j^1}^{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes u_{2j^n-1}^{\alpha_n} \otimes u_{2j^n}^{\alpha_n} \ ,$$

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left(\sqrt{\rho_{1\cdots N}}\ |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|\right) \leq \frac{N^N}{(N!)^2} \ .$$

□

4.1 Proofs of the entanglement bounds

Proof of Theorem 2.1. To show that $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) \geq \ln 2$, we claim that it suffices to show that if ρ_{12} is any fermionic density matrix on $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}$, then

$$S(\rho_1) \geq \ln 2 \ . \tag{4.13}$$

The reason for this sufficiency is that $\mathrm{E_f}$ is a convex combination of such one-body entropies, and if each is bounded below by $\ln 2$ then so is the convex combination.

By Coleman's Theorem [11] we know that the largest eigenvalue of ρ_1 is at most $1/2$. The smallest entropy of ρ_1 occurs, therefore, whenever ρ_1 has exactly two eigenvalues equal to $1/2$ and the entropy is then $\ln 2$. This occurs exactly when ρ_1 is the reduced density matrix of a two-particle Slater determinant. This proves that $\mathrm{E_f} \geq \ln 2$, and equality occurs if and only if ρ_{12} is a convex combination of pure two-particle Slater determinant states.

Another proof of (4.13), in the spirit of Theorem 3.1, starts by using (3.2) to write

$$2S(\rho_1) \geq S(\rho_1) + \tfrac{1}{2}\ln 2 - \tfrac{1}{2}\ln[1 - \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2] \ . \tag{4.14}$$

Note that in this normalization, the eigenvalues of ρ_1 are at most $1/2$, and thus $\mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2 \leq 1/2$. Therefore, letting $x := \mathrm{Tr}\rho_1^2$, and using (3.5) to estimate $S(\rho_1)$ in terms of x, that

$$2S(\rho_1) \geq \inf_{0 \leq x \leq 1/2} \left\{ -\ln x - \tfrac{1}{2}\ln(1-x) + \tfrac{1}{2}\ln 2 \right\} \ .$$

A simple calculation shows that the minimum is achieved at $x = 1/2$, and this yields (4.13). □

Note that when ρ_{12} is a pure state, then ρ_1 is rank two with with eigenvalues $1/2$ and zero. In this case, (3.5) is an equality.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let Ψ be an N-particle Slater determinant. We choose ρ_{123} to be the k-particle reduced density matrix with $k \geq 2$. Thus, $\mathcal{H}_3$ is the $k-2$-particle fermionic space, which has dimension $\binom{N}{k-2}$. We compute as follows.

$$S_{123} = \ln \binom{N}{k}, \ S_3 = \ln \binom{N}{k-2}, \ S_{13} = S_{23} = \ln \binom{N}{k-1}.$$

Thus,

$$-S_{123} - S_3 + S_{13} + S_{23} = \ln(k/(N-k)) + \ln((N-k+1)/(k-1),$$

and the theorem is proved by choosing $k = N/2$ for N even and $k = (N+1)/2$ for N odd. □

APPENDIX: Two-particle entropy of the Yang state [14]

The one-particle Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^M$ and the number of particles is $N \leq M$. Both N and M are even integers, so we define $m = M/2$ and $n = N/2$. We choose an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}$, u_i with $1 \leq i \leq M$ and we consider the set of $2n$-particle Slater determinants that are composed of n pairs of vectors $\pi_i = u_{2i}, u_{2(i+1)}$. There are $2m$ such pairs and there are $\binom{m}{n}$ such determinants, denoted by ϕ_α. The Yang state (a vector in $\mathcal{H}^{\wedge N}$) is given by

$$|\Psi\rangle = \binom{m}{n}^{-1/2} \sum_\alpha \phi_\alpha. \tag{4.15}$$

Let γ be the 2-particle reduced density matrix for the pure state $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ *normalized so that its trace is* $\binom{N}{2}$. (This will simplify a number of expression below.)It is easy to compute the matrix elements of γ (with $i < j$ and $k < \ell$):

$$\binom{m}{n} \langle u_i \wedge u_j | \, \gamma \, | u_k \wedge u_\ell \rangle = \begin{cases} \binom{m-1}{n-1} & \text{if } i,j = k,\ell \text{ is a pair } \pi_i \\ \binom{m-2}{n-1} & \text{if } i,j \text{ and } k,\ell \text{ are unequal pairs} \\ \binom{m-2}{n-2} & \text{if } i,j \text{ and } k,\ell \text{ are equal and not pairs} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

Therefore, the matrix γ has the structure

$$\gamma = \frac{n(m-n)}{m-1} |\chi\rangle\langle\chi| + \frac{n(n-1)}{m(m-1)} P_{\mathcal{H}\wedge\mathcal{H}} \tag{4.17}$$

where

$$\chi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} u_{2j} \wedge u_{2j-1} \ ,$$

and where $P_{\mathcal{H}\wedge\mathcal{H}}$ is the orthogonal projection in $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}$ onto $\mathcal{H}\wedge\mathcal{H}$. Therefore, γ will have two different eigenvalues, with multiplicities μ, as follows:

$$\frac{n(m-n)}{m-1}+\frac{n(n-1)}{m(m-1)},\quad \mu=1; \qquad \frac{n(n-1)}{m(m-1)},\quad \mu=2m^2-m-1. \tag{4.18}$$

Using either (4.17) or (4.18), one computes that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\gamma)=\frac{n(m-n)}{m-1}+(2m^2-m-1)\frac{n(n-1)}{m(m-1)}=2n^2-n=\tbinom{N}{2}\ ,$$

as it must be.

Now letting ρ_{12} denote the normalized 2-particle reduces density matrix, we have

$$\rho_{12}=\frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|+\frac{n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)}P_{\mathcal{H}\wedge\mathcal{H}}\ , \tag{4.19}$$

and that its eigenvalues and multiplicities are

$$\frac{m^2-mn+n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)},\quad \mu=1; \qquad \frac{n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)},\quad \mu=2m^2-m-1. \tag{4.20}$$

The entropy is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho_{12}) &= \ln[(2n-1)m(m-1)] \\ &- \frac{m^2-mn+n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)}\ln[m^2-mn+n-1] \\ &- (2m^2-m-1)\frac{n-1}{(2n-1)m(m-1)}\ln[n-1]\ . \end{aligned}$$

Asymptotically, for $M\gg N\gg 1$, the leading term is $S(\rho_{12})\asymp 2\ln M$. Thus, S can be much larger than $O(\ln N)$, as it is for a determinant, and can even be infinite. Although the pairing state has a larger eigenvalue (asymptotically $2/N$ instead of $2/N^2$), and potentially a smaller entropy, it has so many small eigenvalues that its entropy can be huge.

The same computations may be used to compute $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12})$ and to estimate $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12})$. Let α denote the completely antisymmetric state on $\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{H}$; i.e., $\alpha=(m(2m-1))^{-1}P_{\mathcal{H}\wedge\mathcal{H}}$. The we may write (4.19) as

$$\rho_{12}=\frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|+\left(1-\frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}\right)\alpha\ , \tag{4.21}$$

In any decomposition, $\rho_{12}=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\lambda_k\omega^k$, one of the ω_k must be $|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$ and the corresponding λ_k must be at least $\frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}$. Since $S(\mathrm{Tr}_1|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|)=\ln m$, it follows from these computations and Theorem 2.1 that

$$\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12})-\ln(2)=\frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}[\ln(m)-\ln(2)]\ .$$

Since $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|) = \ln(m)$ it follows from the convexity of squashed entanglement [7] and Theorem 2.3 that

$$\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12}) \leq \frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)} \ln(m) + \left(1 - \frac{(m-n)}{(2n-1)(m-1)}\right) \tfrac{1}{2} \ln\left(\tfrac{m+1}{m-1}\right) \ .$$

Note that for $M \gg N \gg 1$, the leading term is $\mathrm{E_f}(\rho_{12}) \asymp \frac{\ln M}{N}$, and the lower bound on $\mathrm{E_{sq}}(\rho_{12})$ is of the same order. and is, presumably, close to optimal. □

Acknowledgments: We thank U. Marzolino and J. Schliemann for helpful correspondence. We thank the U.S. National Science Foundation for support by grants DMS 1201354 (E.A.C.) and PHY 0965859 and PHY-1265118 (E.H.L.).

References

[1] L. Amico, R. Favio, A. Osterloh and V. Vedral, *Entanglement in many-body systems,* Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 517-576 (2008)

[2] H. Araki and E. H. Lieb, *Entropy Inequalities*, Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 160-170 (1970).

[3] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Popescu, B. Schumacher, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, *Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **76**, no. 5, 1996, pp. 722-725, Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett., **78**, no. 10, 1997, p. 2031.

[4] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, *Mixed state entanglement and quantum error correction* Phys. Rev. A, **54**, no. 5, 1996, pp. 3824-3851.

[5] F. Brandao, M. Christandl, and J. Yard, *Faithful squashed entanglement* Commun. Math. Phys. **306**, 2011, pp 805

[6] E. A. Carlen and E. H. Lieb, *Remainder Terms for Entropy inequalities*, preprint

[7] M. Christandl and A. Winter, *Squashed entanglement – An additive entanglement measure.* J. Math. Phys.,**45**, 2004, pp 829-840.

[8] M. Christandl, N. Schuch and A. Winter, *Entanglement of the antisymmetric state*, Commun. Math. Phys. **311**, 397-422 (2012).

[9] K. Eckert, J. Schliemann, D. Bruß and M. Lewenstein. *Quantum Correlations in Systems of Indistinguishable Particles*, Annals of Physics **299**, 88127 (2002).

[10] E. H. Lieb and M. B. Ruskai, *Proof of the Strong Subadditivity of Quantum-Mechanical Entropy,i* J. Math. Phys. **14**, 1938-1941 (1973).

[11] E. H. Lieb and R. Seiringer *The Stability of Matter in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2010).

[12] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods*, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, (1993).

[13] R. Tucci, *Entanglement of distillation and conditional mutual information*, eprint quant-ph/0202144, (2002).

[14] C. N. Yang, *Concept of off-diagonal long-range order and the quantum phases of liquid He and of superconductors*, Reviews of Modern Physics **34**, 694-704 (1962).